

NEMT - RFP

Technical and Cost Proposal Summary

6 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
TMS	2607.5	1200	3807.5	1st	
MTM	2680	1010	3690	2nd	MO Call Center
		986	3666	3rd	DSM Call Center
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	1050	3605.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	1066	3529.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	905	2820	6th	

3 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
TMS	2607.5	600	3207.5	1st	
MTM	2680	525	3205	2nd	MO Call Center
		512	3192	3rd	DSM Call Center
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	546	3101.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	563	3026.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	459	2374	6th	

1 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
MTM	2680	176	2856	1st	MO Call Center
		171	2851	2nd	DSM Call Center
TMS	2607.5	200	2807.5	3rd	
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	182	2737.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	198	2661.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	150	2065	6th	

NEMT Brokerage: RFP MED-10-011
Cost Proposals Comparison

5.4.3 Scoring of Bidder Cost Proposals

The bid with the lowest cost will receive the full point score available (200) for the cost proposal. In order to calculate every other bidder's score, the lowest bidder's cost proposal will be divided into the corresponding value of the other bidder(s) and then multiplied by the maximum points. The formula for each is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Bidder's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost} / \text{Bidder Cost}) \times \text{Maximum Points}$$

Vendor	Year 1	Pts.	Year 2	Pts.	Year 3	Pts.	Year 4	Pts.	Year 5	Pts.	Year 6	Pts.	Total Pts.	Div. By 6
TMS Management Group, Inc.	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.01	200	\$ 2.01	200	\$ 2.01	200	1,200	200
LogistiCare	\$ 2.16	198	\$ 2.32	184	\$ 2.37	181	\$ 2.38	169	\$ 2.40	168	\$ 2.41	167	1,066	178
Access2Care Transportation Solutions	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.38	169	\$ 2.40	168	\$ 2.40	168	1,050	175
Medical Transportation Management, Inc.														
Missouri Call Center:	\$ 2.43	176	\$ 2.45	175	\$ 2.46	174	\$ 2.47	163	\$ 2.48	162	\$ 2.50	161	1,010	168
Des Moines Call Center:	\$ 2.50	171	\$ 2.51	171	\$ 2.52	170	\$ 2.53	159	\$ 2.54	158	\$ 2.55	158	986	164
RideSource	\$ 2.85	150	\$ 2.80	153	\$ 2.75	156	\$ 2.70	149	\$ 2.70	149	\$ 2.70	149	905	151

NEMT - RFP

Evaluation Team Summary Score Sheet

To be filled out by the Evaluation Team Leader and submitted to the issuing officer.

Evaluator	Ride Source (Bidder name)	Logist Case (Bidder name)	THR/Access 2 Case (Bidder name)	TMS (Bidder name)	MTM (Bidder name)
1	310	460	430	512.5	490
2	355	502.5	570	565	502.5
3	500	500	585	480	570
4	510	546	508	600	600
5	240	455	462.5	450	517.5
TOTAL Points	1915	2463.5	2555.5	2607.5	2680

Date: 4-30-10

Team Leader Signature: 1

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	Logisti Care
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?


Yes.

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Member education, availability in urban & rural areas, after hours service, simplify member eligibility verification process.

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes.

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 80%	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/24/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	Logisti Care
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:


(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes. A# B - Exceptions to RFP.

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

Not addressed in proposal.

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 60%	Total points 30
Evaluator's Signature 	Date 4/24/10	
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature	Date	
RFP Project Director Signature	Date	

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

Yes.

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Policies : Procedures : Quality Mgmt Committee (PnP : QMC) directs QA.
Monitor call queues, track licenses : insurance, track : resolve complaints.
Reports available.

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80%	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature [Redacted]		Date 4/24/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	Logisti Care
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Yes.

LogistiCAD - member data, exchange in fo, analyze, reports.

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

Known as General Manager in current structure.

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services? Yes.

Logisti CAD.

Operations Manual template.

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Yes.

Outreach mtgs w/ providers.

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them? Pg 64 - will allow. Stmt of claim forms.

Automated trip assignment - question unanswered on using other than Network provider.
Sent recruitment info to 200 providers. Benefits for network providers - unclear on ability to use other provider.

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services? Not specifically under 3.3.2.2 heading but addresses with:

LogistiCAD.

CSR call script.

MUIS on recurring member eligibility file.

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

Establish call center in Des Moines area meeting Smile guideline.

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Capital Center, toll-free service, advance reservations.
Bi-lingual staff, hearing impaired.

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

CSRS will have ongoing training on assigning appropriate service levels. Info part of member's history.
Schedule w/ same providers.

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

On-going monitoring, real-time response to late trips.

Reports software.

Call center responsibilities. QA.

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Pays clean claims w/in 20 days (RFP std is 90% paid w/in 10 days).
Say they will meet standard.

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Member education attachments - "Where's My Ride".

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes.

Record of 2 complaints per 1000 trips.

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?


Respond to verbal complaints w/in one day.

Reports to Dept.

~~Unsure role in hearing.~~ pg 90 - will represent Dept.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80%	Total points 320
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/24/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	Logisti Care
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes.

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Yes.

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Yes.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes*
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP? *Yes*

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Inc Commitment to Iowa - relates to RFP.

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? *Yes*
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? *No phone # on Merrill Lynch letter.*

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number; *Yes*
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination? *Yes*

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up? *Yes*


Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services? *None - no pending or threatened litigation.*

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony? *No.*

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others? *No.*

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% <i>60%</i>	Total points 30
Evaluator's Signature 		Date <i>4/24/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.5 Technical Proposal Evaluation Report

The Department is interested in proposals that provide well-organized, all-inclusive, and technically sound business solutions. Ambiguous explanations will challenge the proposer's credibility and will result in a negative impact upon the bidder's evaluation report.

The Technical Proposal Evaluation Team will compile a Technical Proposal Evaluation Report. The Report will contain, at a minimum:

- A tool to record impressions and other comments (such as follow up questions for the evaluation team) developed during the proposal evaluation for each respective bidder.
- Individual bidder score sheets that will include the individual evaluator scores and the final calculated average score for the bidder
- Compilation of bidder average scores for all bidders, including their final Technical Proposal ranking

Logistics

Serv Reg -

pg 7 - Operations Manual

8 - LogistiCAD database system

- Backup system in real time so no data lost.
- Inc reservations editor
- Inc reports; can add data Dept wants to track.

AHB - Exceptions to RFP -

Terminate w/ 180 day notice

Publicly traded company

- Weekly webinars during implementation.
- Already met w/ 14 providers.
- URAC accredited.
- Work in 39 States.
- Experience ↑
- System / IT.

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	2

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

✓

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

✓

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

✓

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 95	Total points 47.5
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 90	Total points 45
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

✓

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

✓

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 90	Total points 45
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

✓

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

✓

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

✓

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

✓

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?



2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?



3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?



Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?



Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?



Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?



4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?



5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

✓

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

✓

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

✓

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80	Total points 320
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80	Total points 320
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- a. Project Title
- b. Contact organization name
- c. Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- d. Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project?
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability?
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference?

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

23 yrs in business
 NOD issued in 72 hrs.
 Average 20 days invoice paid.
 Low rider complaint (0.023%)
 Call Center average answer speed 45 seconds.

- Request to Proposal change or many RFP. - amendments.
 - 180 days notice to OTS of cancellation.

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 90	Total points 45
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes -

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Yes

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes - extensive

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

States "Our agility & adaptability make it possible for us to adjust operations to accommodate any required changes"

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

Yes -

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Yes - *operational procedures - pro-active*
real time
audit & review
CAP

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28/16
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

URAC

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Yes - seem to have an extensive system of management of all aspects.

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

aka General Manager - Once the Account Manager is hired, will be responsible for most all things.
Call Center will be in IA

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

unique call script CSRs will follow
LogistiCAD will populate what CSRs need to know about eligibility - all procedures are fully documented

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

They will utilize all aspects of public transport as well as volunteers, etc. Already has contacted some of the existing trans. providers in IA.

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

LogistiCAD typically would assign the provider based upon a predetermined set of assignment criteria. Transportation dept. can manually assign providers.

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Will verify through MMIS - wants to receive a recurring member elig. file that can be imported into LogistiCAD, if possible.

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

yes

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

yes

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

yes

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

yes

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

No explanation but agree that they will.

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

1 day for verbal - 3 days for written complaints

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

If a member disagrees with resolution of a grievance or complaint, they will explain the process to the member. Agree to represent dept in hearing.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 400
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 300
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/30/10
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity? *Not all - too many to do -*

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Yes - all

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP: *Yes -*

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes pg. 19*
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP? *Yes pg. 19*

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP? *Yes -*

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes.

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? *Yes.*
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? *One has no contact info*

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Yes - pg. 42*
- Full name, address, and telephone number;
 - Date established; *1999*
 - Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.) *public -*
 - Description of business operations; *Yes -*
 - Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and *7*
 - A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

Yes -

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up? *Yes -*
Yes - several

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services? *Yes, none*

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?
No, pg. 45
No

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points <i>50</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/28/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

LogistiCare

Exceptions to RFP / Contract language -
Sounds like they can't deliver on
what is requested of them.

Attachment A:

LogistiCare didn't confirm compliance
by typing or printing "Yes" in the
"Bidder Check" column.

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	<i>Logisticare</i>
EVALUATOR Number:	<i>4</i>

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

*Yes Exec summary Pages 1-2
Satisfies requirements on 4.2.4*

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

*Yes increase communication weekly member checking
expanded ACO
After hour care*

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes → located on Exec Summary pag 4

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	<i>LogisticsCare</i>
EVALUATOR Number:	<i>4</i>

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes. Vol I Study is cited. They list concerns from this study which are reflected in the RFP

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

*Yes - Monitor education & outreach
Plan for NEMT expansion*

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/27/0</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	<i>Logistilore</i>
EVALUATOR Number:	<i>4</i>

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

QA - Yes
internal & external QA

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Yes -
Satisfactory - Not a lot of detail

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points <i>50</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>7/27/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	LogisticsCare
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

- 1 Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?
- 2 Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?
- 3 Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

#1- Pg 35 lists experience + plan
 #2 Call center established at Capital Center
 #3 Network plan - See providers as partners - 10 call centers, from their experience
 Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

1. Acc Manager - Pg 36 Not named at this time

-1 → 2) Call Center - I want specific number of call center staff addressed

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Yes pg 68 → 77
 is stated

Uses Program Logistics

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Pg 3 says Summary
 begin withings + Accurate materials sent

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

yes

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

yes. Page - 23 described - Gatekeeper function is part of LogeCad system

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

No

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

yes ps 36

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

could not find

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

*ps 47, ps 48 - general plan
ps LogeCad ps 8, 9, 10*

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

yes thru LogeCad system thru paper on Website

ps 78 - 79

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Could not find

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

*Yes pg 81-85 Recorded on Logbook
Pg 43-44 Grievance & Appeals*

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

*Yes - 3.3.2.2.2 Acknowledges
that we are a requirement*

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 390
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/12
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 346
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	Logan's Care
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes Section 6 p 46 Contracts in 36 states
pg 8

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Yes - detailed on pg 11 + 12

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- a. Project Title Yes Yes Yes
- b. Contact organization name Yes Yes Yes
- c. Contact name, title, and current telephone number Yes Yes Yes
- d. Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP. Yes Yes Yes

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization
Yes Has Yes

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes P. 19*
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP? *No*

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Yes

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes P. 7

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? *Yes, yes yes*
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? *Yes yes yes*

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number; *Yes*
- Date established; *Yes*
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.) *Yes*
- Description of business operations; *Yes*
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and *Yes*
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

Yes

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination? *Yes ps 42*

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up? *Yes Description + amounts listed on 45-46*

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services? *Yes - None*

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Not listed

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

Answered → None

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.5 Technical Proposal Evaluation Report

The Department is interested in proposals that provide well-organized, all-inclusive, and technically sound business solutions. Ambiguous explanations will challenge the proposer's credibility and will result in a negative impact upon the bidder's evaluation report.

The Technical Proposal Evaluation Team will compile a Technical Proposal Evaluation Report. The Report will contain, at a minimum:

- A tool to record impressions and other comments (such as follow up questions for the evaluation team) developed during the proposal evaluation for each respective bidder.
- Individual bidder score sheets that will include the individual evaluator scores and the final calculated average score for the bidder
- Compilation of bidder average scores for all bidders, including their final Technical Proposal ranking

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Attachment B
exceptions to
Contract (a)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Yes

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Could not
figure out
Iowa staffing level

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 75	Total points 37 1/2
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/26/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes Some sense of "we know how to do it better than you"

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 80	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/26/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

Yes

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Attitude seems to be that "we move than exceed your standards — we don't really need to account for your standards."

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 70	Total points 35
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Yes

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

Yes

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Yes

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Yes considerable discussion of incentives, etc.

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

Yes

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Yes

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

backed up by 24/7 center in AZ
PSM 13 hr/day
OPI

staffing level unclear

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Yes

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

18 ADA vehicles statewide?

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

Monitored/tracked

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Yes although does not mention state possibility of
arbitration of unresolved provider claims

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Not sound at this point, intent but addressed elsewhere
Yes

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Does not acknowledge IME arbitration of broker/provider disputes

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 75	Total points 300
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	LogistiCare
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

pure broker as opposed to direct provider & broker
mostly capitated

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

examples of each don't see comprehensive list

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Yes

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes*

- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Local Gen Mgr?

Jason Harbitz?

No other Iowa-based staff

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

IDed

Yes

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability?
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference?

*2 banks
and CPA*

No phone BOLL

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up? *Yes no fault*

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% <i>85</i>	Total points <i>42 1/2</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/27/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date